REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-19 remain pending.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 7-9 and 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of their respective base claim and any intervening claims. In this Reply, Applicant has rewritten claims 7, 9, and 16 in independent form. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims should be indicated as allowable.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-4, 10-14, and 17-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Murayama et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,346,936). Claims 5-6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Murayama* in view of *Kenji* (JP 06-12195). These rejections, insofar as they pertain to the presently pending claims, are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an image display apparatus comprising: an image signal processing circuit receiving an image signal and processing the image signal for display as an image; an image display unit receiving the image signal processed by the image signal processing circuit, and displaying the processed image

signal as an image on a screen; and a control circuit receiving the image signal from the image signal processing circuit and varying a waveform characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner.

In reply to Applicant's argument that the timing generator (4) in *Murayama* merely generates a timing signal that varies the timing "for sampling the image signal" periodically, and therefore does not vary the "waveform characteristic" of the image signal as recited in by claim 1, the Examiner asserts on page 2 of the Office Action that *Murayama* discloses in col. 5, lines 2-56, that the PLL circuit (41) operates so that the phase of the video timing detected by the RGB signal processing circuit (10) is made consistent with the phase of the pulse signal obtained by frequency-dividing the oscillation output of the VCO (44) in the divider (45). Also, in col. 6, lines 1-5, according to the Examiner, *Murayama* discloses that if the control input voltage is modulated by the pulse waveform every line or every field to periodically vary the phase of pictures to the pixels, a spatial frequency filter in which the variation of the phase corresponds to a cut-off frequency is achieved. Based on the above observations in *Murayama*, the Examiner concludes that the phases of the fields of the video signal are periodically varied with respect to the pixels and that changing the phases of the video signal changes the waveform characteristic of the video signal, because the waveform

of the video signal has been shifted with respect to time. The Examiner therefore asserts that varying the time of the output of the PLL of *Murayama* anticipates the recited "varying the waveform characteristic of the image signal" in claim 1. Applicant disagrees.

The "control circuit" in *Murayama*, which is the timing generator (40) in the rejection, receives a picture timing signal from the RGB signal processing circuit (10) and generates timing signals to the RGB driver (20) and the LCD panel (30). The timing generator does not receive the image signal directly, nor does it act directly on the image signal. On the other hand, the control circuit of the present invention is connected in such a way that it receives the image signal directly from the image signal processing circuit, and varies the waveform characteristic of the image signal in a periodic manner. And then the image signal is forwarded to the image display unit. *Murayama*'s timing generator does not receive, nor directly act on, the image signal from the signal processing circuit. Applicant has amended claim 1 to clarify this distinction.

Furthermore, Applicant maintains that the timing generator (4) of *Murayama* does not vary "the waveform characteristic of the image signal." This timing generator (4) alternately creates a first state in which the relationship between the waveform of the image signal (video signal) and the sampling position(timing) in the odd-

numbered line and the even-numbered line becomes the relationship shown in Fig. 6D and a second state (not shown) in which the sampling position of the odd-numbered line and the even-numbered line becomes reverse to the first state (see col. 4, line 62 - col. 5, line 5). In other words, the timing generator (4) of *Murayama* merely varies the position of the upward arrow (sampling position) in Fig. 6D, and does not perform any processing to the image signal (video signal) which is described over the upward arrow in Fig. 6D. In contrast thereto, the present invention is designed to vary the waveform characteristics of "the image signal".

Thus, *Murayama* fails to anticipate claim 1 or any claim depending therefrom. Furthermore, independent method claim 12 (and claims depending therefrom) define over *Murayama* based on similar reasoning.

Regarding the secondary reference, *Kenji*, which the Examiner relies on as allegedly teaching features of certain dependent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that this reference fails to make up for the deficiencies of *Murayama* discussed above. The coils L1 and L2 of *Kenji* do not vary the waveform characteristics of the image signal. Those coils are attached to the neck portion of the color cathode-ray tube and generate alternating field in a vertical direction (see Fig. 5 and page 2, lines 50-54 (paragraph [0022])). Due to this, three primary colors (red, green, and blue) electronic

beams are slightly waved leftward and rightward, and thus the display position of the color image signal which is supplied to the color cathode-ray tube is slightly shifted leftward and rightward. That is, those coils L1 and L2 merely vary the direction of movement of the electron beam, thereby shifting the display position. Therefore, those coils L1 and L2 do not perform any processing to the image signal, which generated the electron beam. In contrast thereto, the present invention is designed to vary the waveform characteristics of "the image signal." Thus, the asserted combination of *Murayama* and *Kenji* (assuming these references may be combined, which Applicant does not admit) fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of any pending claim.

At least in view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendments presented herein. Claims 7, 9, and 16 have been rewritten in independent form in accordance with the Examiner's indication of allowability. Furthermore, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 in a manner that more clearly distinguishes over the applied prior art. Such amendments are not believed to raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
D. Richard Anderson, #40,439

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

DRA/jdm
2257-0207P